

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP

Friday, March 12, 1999
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Ocotillo Conference Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Michael Branham, Surprise, Chair
Bruce Meyers for Timothy Brand, AZ Dept. of
Administration
Mickey Ohland, Chandler
*Jeff Sargent, American Society of Landscape
Architects
Tami Ryall, Gilbert
Richard Janke, Glendale
*Aaron Iverson, Maricopa County

Steve Hancock, Mesa
Tracy Stevens for Larry Fudurich, Peoria
Lorry Kuiper, Phoenix Planning
Mark Melnychenko, Phoenix Transit
Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA
*Deborah Astin, Scottsdale
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Coomer, MAG
Bruce Landis, Sprinkle Consulting
Jim Coffman, The Planning Center

1. Call to Order

Chairman Mike Branham called the meeting to order at 10:38.

2. Call to the Audience

No audience was present to address the Working Group.

3. Approval of the January 25, 1999 and February 16, 1999 Meeting Minutes

Steve Hancock moved to approve the minutes from the January 25, 1999 and February 16, 1999 meetings. Eric Iwersen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Pedestrian Plan Update

The Planning Center has been selected to update the Pedestrian Area Plan. Dawn Coomer provided some introductory comments on the scope of the project. Jim Coffman then discussed expectations of the plan

update with members of the committee, and the Working Group provided some guidance. Bruce Landis then briefly discussed the projects tasks and scope of work for the plan, and noted that meetings would be minimized when possible. He explained that the next few months would be busy with identifying goals and objectives, issues, and opportunities and barriers. He explained that projects could be evaluated using different quantitative methods, including the roadside pedestrian conditions model and the latent demand score model. These methods help to give numbers to general policies. He then provided substantial information on the different models. He noted that the plan update contract could include assessment of up to four corridors using latent demand, and up to 900 miles could be evaluated using the roadside pedestrian conditions model. He noted that rating criteria could give higher priority to areas with higher latent demand and lower roadside pedestrian conditions.

The committee then discussed which areas to select in using the different evaluation methods. A suggestion was made to use the 15 areas identified in Working Paper Two prepared for the Pedestrian Area Design Guidelines. Dawn distributed a copy of the areas to the committee, and the committee decided to review the list to make sure they were still the best to consider. Bruce suggested doing detailed design guidelines for each of the four types of pedestrian areas defined in the existing policies and design guidelines: neighborhood, community, campus and district. The committee agreed to consider this issue, and discuss it further at the next meeting. The next meeting would consider the final appearance of the plan to establish a framework for analysis. The next meeting date was set for April 9 at 10:30 a.m.

The committee continued to discuss a list of stakeholders to involve during the plan update. A list was distributed by Jim, and the committee gave suggestion on who to include in the various categories. Bruce explained that the stakeholders would serve to provide input to the Working Group on plan topics. Jim noted that a stakeholders meeting would probably be held on April 9th as well, and that contact information for the stakeholders should be obtained as soon as possible.

5. Update on the Pedestrian Design Assistance Program

Dawn addressed the committee and noted that nine consultant proposals and five project proposals were received for the Design Assistance Program. She noted that to keep the schedule for awarding funds this FY, the Management Committee would recommend the list of projects at the April 14th meeting. This meant that Working Group input was needed by the end of the month. She asked for ways to proceed on evaluating the proposals and projects, and the committee discussed this. Mike Branham suggested that the project sponsors come to a meeting to present project details. The committee agreed, and a meeting was scheduled for March 26th at 10:30 a.m. Mike requested that project sponsors be asked to cut back on the size of their request so that more projects could be funded.

Some committee members agreed to help review the consultant proposals for inclusion on the on-call list. Mark Melnychenko, Eric Iwersen and Tracy Stevens agreed to assist with this task, and to provide a report to the entire committee at their next meeting.

6. Update on Transportation Review Committee (TRC) Activities

Steve Hancock provided an update on recent TRC activities, which included adoption of the list of pedestrian and bicycle projects.

7. Future Agenda Items and Meeting Dates

Mike summarized the next scheduled meeting dates and the items which would be discussed at each.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.